



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,239	03/17/2004	Alex A. Kipman	MS303877.01 / MSFTP582US	5256
27195 7590 07/16/2007 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER WEI, ZHENG	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,239

Applicant(s)

KIPMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Zheng Wei

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/21/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed on 03/17/2004.
2. Claims 1-36 are pending and have been examined.

Oath/Declaration

3. The Office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed oath/declaration filed on March 17, 2004.

Priority

4. The priority date considered for this application is March 17, 2004.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statements filed 06/21/2004 has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered.

Drawings

6. The drawings filed on March 17, 2004 are accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 1-7 and 10-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 11: Claims 1 and 11 claim two systems, which comprise a build process, a policy component/file. However, all of these components are software components/process implemented/executed by instruction sequences. Such claimed software module/process are software program listings per se and they do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 are not statutory. See MPEP 2106.01(I)

Claims 2-6, 10 and 12-19: Claims 2-6, 10 and 12-19 are dependent claims of claim 1 and claim 11 respectively. These claims all fail to remedy the 35 USC 101 nonstatutory problems of claims 1 and 11. Therefore, they are also rejected for the same reason.

--These rejections can be overcome by adding computer hardware components e.g., memory, and processor into the claims that permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.

Claims 7 and 20: Claims 7 and 20 recite the limitation of a computer-readable medium, as defined in the specification at page 12, lines 7-15, includes non-statutory embodiments, such as signals and carrier waves. A signal, a form of energy, is not a tangible physical article or object and it does not fall within either of the two definitions of manufacture. Thus, such media do not fall within one of the four statutory categories. Therefore, the above claims are non-statutory.

Claim 21-31: Claims 21-31 are dependent claims of claim 20. Therefore, they also rejected for the same reason.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7: Claim 7 recites a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the system. It is not clear how the computer executable instructions can carry out the system which comprises computer hardware. For the purpose of compact prosecution, the Examiner

treats this claim as computer executable instructions for carrying out the build process when they are executed by computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cynerman (Michael Cymerman, Automate your build process using Java and Ant) in view of Jerger (US 6,321,334).

Claim 1:

Cynerman discloses a system that facilitates management of a build process, comprising:

- a build process that processes one or more build entities (see for example, p.1, section Introducing the powerful XML-based scripting tool, Ant. "A defined build process" and related description); and
- a policy component that is processed by the build process within which the build process operates (see for example, p.3, example of simple.xml file includes build policy/rules for build process)

Cynerman also discloses using "include/exclude" entities to match the pattern in the name attribute from the compilation (see for example, p.6, first and second paragraphs). But Cynerman does not explicitly disclose determining one or more levels of trust within which the build process operates.

However, Jerger in the same analogous art of computer-based system discloses a method of configuration of a system security policy that is stored on a host computer, (see for example, Figure 8, items 812 Unsigned Permissions, 814 Trusted Signed Permissions, 816 Untrusted Signed Permissions and related text) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to define those different levels of trust for the build entities and use Cynerman's "include/exclude" entities to match the pattern in the name attribute about the levels of trust from the compilation. One would have been motivated to do so to secure the build process by automatically administering the decision to grant or deny permissions to specific build entities as suggested by Jerger (see for example, col.2, lines 27-51)

Claim 2:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 1, Jerger further discloses the levels of trust include levels that are representative of trusted (Unsigned Permissions), semi-trusted (Trusted Signed Permissions), and untrusted (Untrusted Signed Permissions). (see for example, Figure 8, items 812 Unsigned Permissions, 814 Trusted Signed Permissions, 816 Untrusted Signed

Permissions and related text).

Claim 3:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 1, Cynerman further discloses the policy component includes one or more policy files that are processed by the build process (see for example, p.3, example of simple.xml file includes build policy/rules for build process).

Claim 4:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 1, Cynerman further discloses the policy component includes one or more policy files that are processed by the build process before the one or more build entities are built (see for example, p.3, example of simple.xml file includes build policy/rules for build process).

Claim 5:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 1, Cynerman further discloses the one or more entities include at least one of a project, a task, a logger, and operating system (OS) account information (see for example, p.3, example of simple.xml file includes project; also see example command line, p.7, XmlLogger for writing a reporting tool).

Claim 6:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 1, Jerger further discloses at least one of the one or more build entities are each associated with the one or more of the levels of trust, which associations are defined in the policy component via at least one of a user-definable policy file and a default policy file, at least one or both of which are processed to determine the level of trust for the build process (see for example, Figure 4A, set the security level for this zone, items 408-412 and related text; also see col.18, lines 51-63, "each security zone has a default security level, which is used if not changed by a user").

Claim 7:

Claim 7 is computer program products version of the claimed method, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed in claim 1 above. It is well known in the computer art that such method steps can be implemented as computer program and can be practiced and /or stored on a computer operable media. Thus, it also would have been obvious that the computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the system [build process] of claim 1 in view of reference teachings above.

Claim 8:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 1, Cynerman also discloses a computer that employs the system of claim 1 (see for example, p.3, lines 3-4, NT

Art Unit: 2192

machine).

Claim 9:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 1, Cynerman also discloses a server that employs the system of claim 1 (see for example, p.3, line 3, server's operating system).

Claim 10:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 1, Cynerman also discloses the system of claim 1, the entity is received at least by one of downloading from a website, as part of an e-mail, and a version control system (see for example, p.2, line 1, CVS- Handles package/modules retrieved from a CVS repository).

Claim 11-15:

Claims 11-15 are another system version of claims 1-10 addressed above, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed and/or set forth above. Thus, they also would have been obvious.

Claim 16:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 11, Jerger further discloses an option for setting custom permission level (see for example, Figure 8, item

816 and 824, "Refuse untrusted permission without asking" and related text).

Therefore, it would have been obvious that the build process would exclude and not build those entities when the permission level is representative of untrusted.

Claim 17:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 11, Jerger further discloses the build process operates at the permission level that is a lowest level of trust associated with the one or more build entities (see for example, Figure 8, items 816 "Untrusted Signed Permissions", 822 "Ask for approval of untrusted permissions" and related text).

Claim 18:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 11, Cynerman further discloses the one or more policy files are written in XML (see for example, p.3, example of simple.xml file includes build policy/rules for build process)

Claim 19:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 11, Cynerman further discloses the one or more policy files are adjusted automatically according to one or more parameters (see for example, p.3, bottom line – p.4, line 7 the example of Ant command line parameter, e.g. "init" and related text).

Claims 20 and 21:

Claims 20 and 21 are computer program products version of the claimed method, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed in claims 1-10 above respectively. It is well known in the computer art that such method steps can be implemented as computer program and can be practiced and /or stored on a computer operable media. Thus, they also would have been obvious in view of reference teachings above.

Claim 22:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Cynerman further discloses the method of claim 20, further comprising sending a message when the build process fails (see for example, p.7, section "Reporting enhancements", BuildEvent, "public Throwable getException()" and related text).

Claim 23:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Jerger further discloses, providing a level of trust that allows any operation to be performed during the act of performing (see for example, Figure 8, item 816, "Untrusted Signed Permissions", item 826, "Apply to all permissions not specifically allowed" and related text)

Claim 24:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Jerger further discloses providing a level of trust that allows only a minimal set of operations to be performed during the act of performing (see for example, Figure 8, item 816 and 824, "Refuse untrusted permission without asking" and related text. Therefore, only trusted permission allows.).

Claim 25;

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Jerger further discloses providing a level of trust that aborts the build process during the act of performing (see for example, Figure 4A, "Set the security level for the zone", item 408 "High, exclude content that could damage your computer")..

Claim 26:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Jerger further discloses, the act of associating associates one of the one or more build entities with at least two levels of trust (see for example, Figure 9A, 9C and related text; For setting different Read Access type and Connect Access type).

Claim 27:

Art Unit: 2192

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Jerger further discloses providing a default set of associations between the one or more build entities and one or more levels of trust in the form of a file (see for example, Figure 8, "Edit Custom Permissions", "Save" button can be used to save configuration to file)

Claim 28:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Jerger further discloses, the level of trust is defined according to at least one of user-defined policy data and default policy data (see for example, Figure 4A, default: High, Medium and Low; User defined: Custom).

Claim 29:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Jerger further discloses, the user-defined policy data overrides the default data where a conflict occurs (see for example, col.18, lines 51-63, "each security zone has a default security level, which is used if not changed by a user")..

Claim 30:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Cynerman further discloses, storing the association of the build entity with the level of trust in the form of a file to which access is restricted (see for example, p.3, example of simple.xml file includes build policy/rules for build process; also see p.6, first and

second paragraphs, "include/exclude" and related text).

Claim 31:

Cynerman and Jerger disclose the system of claim 20, Cynerman further discloses, storing the association of the build entity with the level of trust in the form of a file that further relates the use of system resources with the level of trust (see for example, p.6, third paragraph about setting "available" property for using class "com.ibm.bsf.BSFManager").

Claim 32-36:

Claims 32-36 are another system version of claims 1-10 addressed above, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed and/or set forth above. Thus, they also would have been obvious.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zheng Wei whose telephone number is (571) 270-1059 and Fax number is (571) 270-2059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-15:00.

Art Unit: 2192

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571- 272-1000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ZW



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER